

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
MARTINSBURG**

CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER SHY,

Plaintiff,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:19-CV-172
(GROH)**

**RYAN ADAMS,
ANGIE BOOTH, and
ASHLEY CAMBELL,**

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Now before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble. Pursuant to this Court’s Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Trumble for submission of a proposed R&R. Magistrate Judge Trumble issued his R&R [ECF No. 11] on October 24, 2019. In his R&R, Magistrate Judge Trumble recommends that the Plaintiff’s § 1983 Complaint [ECF No. 1] be denied and dismissed without prejudice for failure to exhaust all available administrative remedies.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court must conduct a de novo review of the magistrate judge’s findings where objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and of a plaintiff’s right to appeal this Court’s Order. 28.U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91,


94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen plus three days of service. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The R&R was mailed to the Plaintiff on October 24, 2019. ECF No. 11. The Plaintiff accepted service on October 28, 2019. ECF No. 13. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the R&R, it is the opinion of this Court that Magistrate Judge Trumble's Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 11] should be, and is hereby, **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated therein. Therefore, the Plaintiff's Complaint [ECF No. 1] is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. The Plaintiff's requests for preliminary and permanent injunctions contained in his Complaint [ECF No. 1] and Amended Complaint [ECF No. 8] are hereby **DENIED**. The Court further **ORDERS** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2], Motion to Amend Complaint [ECF No. 6], and Motion to Order Huttonsville to Produce Ledger Sheets [ECF No. 10] be **TERMINATED AS MOOT**.

This matter is **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the Court's active docket. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the Plaintiff by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his last known address as reflected on the docket sheet.

DATED: November 20, 2019


GINA M. GROH
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE